

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

This application has been carefully considered in connection with the Examiner's Office Action dated May 2, 2006. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested in view of the following.

**Summary of Rejections**

Claims 1-18 were pending at the time of the Office Action.

Claims 1-10 and 12-17 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hanawa* et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,450,471) in view of *Kiel* (U.S. Patent No. 4,922,529).

Claims 11 and 18 were objected to.

**Summary of Response**

Claims 1, 3, 12 and 14 were amended.

Claims 4-11, 13, and 15-18 remain as originally submitted.

Remarks and Arguments are provided below.

**Summary of Claims Pending**

Claims 1, and 3-18 are currently pending following this response.

**Response to Rejections under Section 103**

Claims 1-10 and 12-17 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hanawa* et al. (US Patent 5,450,471) in view of *Kiel* (US Patent

4,922,529). The Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections as they would apply to the amended claims.

Regarding claims 1 and 2, the Examiner asserts that *Hanawa* discloses in Figs. 1, 6, 7, 14 a method for notifying a user device (8, 13, 55) coupled to an integrated service hub (1, 11, 56) that communication has been terminated with a remote device (58, 59); col. 16, line 66 to col. 17, line 4, comprising:

receiving a disconnect signal S29 from the remote device (58,59) into the integrated services hub (1, 11, 56), relaying a call termination notification S30 signal to the user device (8, 13) from the integrated services hub (1, 11, 56) via a user device interface (751) coupled to the user device (8, 13, 55) col. 17, lines 9-21).

The Examiner notes that *Hanawa* does not disclose determining whether the user device is off-hook. However, the Examiner asserts that *Kiel* teaches:

an off-hook alert signal in the form of a distinct audio tone or set of audio tones is transmitted to a telephone left off-hook for a period of time without any user activity, col. 1, lines 45-49.

The Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to add a system that determines that the user device is off-hook and provides a call notification signals, such as suggested by *Kiel*, to the system of *Hanawa* in order to provide an apparatus which can be actuated to restore incoming-call service to a telephone which has been inadvertently left off-hook.

The Applicant submits that neither reference teaches an integrated services hub, neither reference teaches determining the status of the user device, and that neither reference teaches placing a user device interface in a disabled state.

The elements 1, 11, and 56 individually or in combination are not an integrated services hub. Element 1 is an automobile telephone, Fig. 6 and col. 9, lines 12-13. Element 11 is part of a mobile telephone unit, Fig. 7, and col. 10, lines 11-12. Element 56 is an automobile telephone, Fig. 1 and col. 1, line 40. Since *Hanawa* does not disclose an integrated services hub, it cannot disclose a user device coupled to an integrated services hub.

The element 751 is not a user device interface coupled to the user device 8 or 13. Element 751 is a man machine interface function in CPU 711 which is part of a portable telephone 710, equivalent to elements 8 and 13, Fig. 12. The element 751 is therefore part of the user device, not an interface coupled to a user device.

It is true that *Hanawa* does not teach determining whether a user device is off hook. Fig. 14 illustrates the scenario where an incoming telephone call is received by the portable telephone. The cited steps S29 and S30 occur when a remote device is disconnected while a call is in progress, at which time the user would be holding the telephone. At step S31 the task 751 transmits a busy tone to the user to inform the user that the other end of the call has disconnected. Col. 17, lines 2-5. (Note that there is an error in *Hanawa* at this point where it should the user "on-hooks" as shown in Fig. 14.) *Hanawa* notifies the user, not the user device, and the notification is an audible tone.

*Kiel* does not teach sending a notification of any kind to either the user or the user device. *Kiel* teaches nothing about receiving a notification that a remote device

has disconnected. *Kiel* teaches nothing about producing a notification that communication with a remote device has been terminated.

*Kiel* teaches detecting the audible off hook signal provided by the telephone company. The telephone company detects when a user telephone has been off hook for too long and sends the audible signal to the telephone in an effort to attract the attention of a user who needs to place the telephone back on hook. This has nothing to do with detecting that a remote device has disconnected or providing a notification of a disconnect signal.

*Kiel* also teaches apparatus for automatically placing the telephone on hook after detecting the audible off hook signal provided by the telephone company. *Kiel* does not receive or detect a call termination or disconnect request from a remote device, i.e. another telephone. *Kiel* does not send a call termination notification signal to the user or the user device. The apparatus of *Kiel* responds to the audible off hook signal by actually placing the telephone in an on hook condition.

Neither reference teaches or suggests providing a call termination notification to a user device as opposed to providing a notification to the user, e.g. the busy tone provided by *Hanawa*. Neither reference teaches or suggests that a call termination notification comprises placing a user device interface in a disabled state.

Only the present Applicant teaches that placing a user device interface in a disabled state is an effective way to cause a user device to change from an off hook state to an on hook state. As taught in paragraph [0027] of the present application, when the interface is placed in a disabled state, the line to the user device is off or dead. As taught in paragraph [0030] of the present application, most user devices

respond to an off or dead line condition by going to the on hook state. The Applicant has provided a system and method for causing a user device to change to on hook state without an audible signal to the user and without modification of the user devices.

In both references, the signals provided to the user are audible. In the present application, the signal to the user device is a dead line. When the line is dead, it is not possible to send an audible signal to the user device or to the user.

In view of these substantial differences, the Applicant submits that claim 1, and its dependent claims are allowable over the cited references.

Claims 12 and 14 were rejected on essentially the same basis as claims 1 and 2. The Applicant submits that the above remarks apply equally well to claims 12 and 14 and show that claims 12 and 14 and their dependent claims are allowable over the cited references.

### **Allowable Subject Matter**

The Examiner has indicated that claims 11 and 18 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Since claims 11 and 18 depend from claims 1 and 14 respectively which have been shown to be patentable above, Applicant submits that claims 11 and 18 should be allowable as dependent claims.

In view of the above remarks, the Applicant requests allowance of claims 1 and 3-18.

**CONCLUSION**

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of any further fees associated with any of the foregoing papers submitted herewith, or to credit any overpayment thereof, to Deposit Account No. 21-0765, Sprint.

Applicant respectfully submits that the present application as amended is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any questions or comments or otherwise feels it would be helpful in expediting the application, he is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (972) 731-2288.

Respectfully submitted,

CONLEY ROSE, P.C.

Date: JULY 10, 2006

5700 Granite Parkway, Suite 330  
Plano, Texas 75024  
Telephone: (972) 731-2288  
Facsimile: (972) 731-2289



Albert C. Metrailler  
Reg. No. 27,145

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT